



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,556	01/02/2004	Emily Lo	LOEM3001/EM	8773

23364 7590 11/02/2005

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 SLATERS LANE
FOURTH FLOOR
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

FRANCIS, FAYE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3725

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

C

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/749,556	Applicant(s) LO, EMILY	
	Examiner Faye Francis	Art Unit 3725	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The objection to the drawings is hereby withdrawn [see applicant's arguments on page 5].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1: the scope of the claim is unclear, since there are no criteria in the claim [or in the specification for that matter] for determining what the applicant considers to comprise "minimum space between mutually adjacent cutting edges" in lines 3-4 from the bottom. Additionally, it is not clear how tens of sheets of paper or cardboard can be fed in between the cutting blades at one time especially since cardboard are much thicker than paper]. It is not clear what structure is responsible for the capabilities recited.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admitted Prior Art in page 1 lines 12-25 of the specification, hereinafter Prior Art in view of either Mylting [3,240,436] or Raterman et al [4,944,462] or Kroger [5,961,058] or Pardee [1,477,848] or Hesse [3,151,645].

Prior Art discloses in Fig 1 most the element of the claims including a pair of cylindrical rotary cutters 1 and 1', which are configured to rotate in opposite directions to each other, each cylindrical rotary cutter includes a polygonal shaft 2 and a plurality of cutting blades 4 that are mounted on the shaft 4, a spacer 6 is configured between each pair of adjacent cutting blades 4 partitioning the cutting blades 4 there between, and thereby allowing the cutting blades 4 to be assembled and mounted in an interleaving fashion on the two cylindrical rotary cutters 1 and 1'.

Prior Art but may not disclose that the plurality of cutting edges are circumferentially arranged and defined on a periphery of each of the pair of blades of the cutting blades, thereby forming a compact assembly of blade edges, and separated by a minimum distance between mutually adjacent cutting edges..

Either Mylting or Raterman et al or Kroger or Pardee or Hesse is cited to show desirability, in the relevant art to have a cutting arrangement wherein the plurality of cutting edges are circumferentially arranged and defined on a periphery of each of the pair of blades of the cutting blades, thereby forming a compact assembly of blade edges, and separated by a minimum distance between mutually adjacent cutting edges. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the blades in the Prior Art paper shredder to have the

particular cutting arrangement as taught by either Mylting or Raterman et al or Kroger or Pardee or Hesse. Either Mylting or Raterman et al or Kroger or Pardee or Hesse in order to comminute the material to be comminuted with low energy requirement but into particles of relatively small size.

Since the device disclosed in the reference includes all of the structural elements of the claims it is presumed to be inherently capable of all the claimed functions including the ability to feed tens of sheets of paper in between the cutting blades at one time.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Faye Francis whose telephone number is 571-272-4423. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derris Banks can be reached on 571-272-4419. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3725

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

FF

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Faye Francis', with a stylized, flowing script.

Faye Francis